

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/875,212	06/07/2001	Lowell Martinson	3755P2332	6074	
23504 7.	590 12/05/2001				
WEISS & MOY PC			EXAM	EXAMINER	
SCOTTSDALI	BROWN AVENUE E, AZ 85251		SHAFER,	RICKY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2872		
			DATE MAILED: 12/05/2001		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		
I ITICA ACTION SIIMMAN	09/875212 MARTINSON	_
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit R, O. SHAFUR 2872	
	R.O. SHAFER 2872	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—	•
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO DF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE $3month(s)$ from the mailing D	ATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply 16 NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default,</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statused and reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>	by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely.
Status	1	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	101	·
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	1	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except 1 accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935.		
Disposition of Claims		
XClaim(s) 1-20	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from considerat	on.
□ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
X Claim(s) 1 -20	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or electi	on
Application Papers	requirement	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ approved □ disapproved.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	d to by the Examiner	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
,,,		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d).	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d).	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)  ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under the content of the con		
<ul> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority ur</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the:</li> </ul>	eived.	
<ul> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority ur</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the:</li> <li>□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been reconstruction.</li> </ul>	eived. eived in Application No	
<ul> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)—(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority ur</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the:</li> <li>□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been reconcerned.</li> <li>□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been reconcerned.</li> </ul>	eived. eived in Application No nave been received	
<ul> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority ur</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the:</li> <li>□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been red</li> <li>□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents</li> </ul>	eived. eived in Application No nave been received Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	
□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)—(d)  □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un  □ All □ Some* □ None of the:  □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been recomplied copies of the priority documents have been recomplied copies of the priority documents in this national stage application from the International *Certified copies not received:	eived. eived in Application No nave been received Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)—(d)  ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un  ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:  ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been red  ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents in this national stage application from the International *Certified copies not received:	eived. eived in Application No nave been received Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un  ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:  ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been red  ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been red  ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents in this national stage application from the International *Certified copies not received:  Attachment(s)	eived. eived in Application No nave been received Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	O-15
□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority unough all □ Some* □ None of the: □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been reconstructed copies of the priority documents have been reconstructed copies of the priority documents in this national stage application from the International *Certified copies not received:  Attachment(s) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)	eived. eived in Application No  nave been received  Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	

Art Unit: 2872

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing 1. to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8, line 1, the use of the numeral "4" would appear misdescriptive of the invention. The examiner suggests changing "4" to read -- 5 --.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the 2. basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis, II 3. (`875).

Davis, II discloses a lateral-view mirror assembly comprising a vehicle (26) and at least one lateral-view mirror (18) coupled to a rear portion of said vehicle in a line of sight with a rearview mirror of said vehicle to view objects lateral to the rear portion of said vehicle.

Note figure 4.

Claims 1, 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Padiou 4. ('109).

Padiou discloses a lateral view mirror assembly comprising a vehicle and first and second lateral-view mirrors (3) coupled to a rear window of said vehicle, wherein said mirrors are in a line of sight with a rear-view and one of said mirrors is positioned between a center portion of

Art Unit: 2872

said rear window and a driver's side of said rear window and the other one of said mirrors is distant from said one of said mirrors and positioned between said center portion of said rear window and a passenger's side of said rear window. Note figures 1 and 3.

5. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stern ('363).

Stern discloses a lateral view mirror assembly comprising a vehicle and at least one lateral-view mirror (M) coupled to a top rear portion of said vehicle in a line of sight with a rear view mirror (R) of said vehicle to view objects lateral to the rear portion of said vehicle. Note figure 2.

6. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gay ('078).

Gay discloses a lateral view mirror assembly comprising a vehicle (V) and at least one lateral-view mirror (8) coupled to a side rear portion of said vehicle in a line of sight with a side mirror (17) of said vehicle to view objects lateral to the rear portion of said vehicle. Note figure 3.

- 7.. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1-4 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards ('418).

Art Unit: 2872

Edwards discloses a forward view mirror system comprising a vehicle, a first mirror (8) coupled to a side rear portion of said vehicle and being coupled to a driver's side view mirror (4) and a second mirror (20) coupled to a rear side portion of said vehicle and being coupled to a passenger's side view mirror (22), note fig. 3, except for explicitly stating that the first and second mirrors are lateral-view mirrors.

It is well know to adjust an angle of a mirror in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of viewing a particular blind spot of interest, such as for viewing objects lateral to a rear portion of a vehicle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and/or within the level or one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to modify the adjustable mirrors (8, 26) of Edwards to an angle, as is well known in the mirror art, in order to view objects lateral of the vehicle.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padiou ('109) in 9. view of Surlan ('223).

Padiou discloses all of the subject matter claimed, note the above explanation, except for explicitly stating that the first and second lateral-view mirrors are coupled to a top surface of a rear portion of a vehicle.

Surlan teaches it is well known to mount a lateral view mirror assembly having two lateral viewing mirrors to a top surface of a rear portion of a vehicle in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of viewing objects lateral of the vehicle.

Art Unit: 2872

Therefore, it would have been obvious and/or within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the mirror assembly of Padiou to a typical vehicle commonly used and employed in the market place, as taught by Surlan, in order to obtain a functionally equivalent lateral view mirror assembly or alternatively modify the lateral view mirrors of Surlan to be separable as taught by Padiou. Note In re Dulberg, 129 USPQ 348 and Nerwin V. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

Claims 5-9 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 10. Davis II ('875) in view of Surlan ('223).

Davis, II discloses all of the subject matter claimed, note the above explanation, except for explicitly stating that the lateral-view mirror assembly is coupled to a top surface of a rear portion of a vehicle.

Surlan teaches it is well known to mount a lateral view mirror assembly to a top surface of a rear portion of a vehicle in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of viewing objects lateral of the vehicle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and/or within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the mirror assembly of Davis II to a top surface of a rear portion of a vehicle, as taught by Surlan, in order to obtain a functionally equivalent lateral view mirror assembly or alternatively modify the lateral view mirror assembly to include the adjustably capabilities of Davis, II. Note In re Dulberg, 129 USPQ 348; Nerwin V. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179. In re Stevens 101 USPQ 28 (CCPA 1954).

Art Unit: 2872

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. D. Shafer at telephone number (703) 08-4813.

Shafer/ds

11/24/01

7. 1. 1. 1. 2. 2872